

## **Remarks**

The Office Action mailed November 12, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-13, 15, 16, 18 and 20 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4-11, 16 and 18 have been amended. Claims 14, 17, and 19 are cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

The objections to the drawings is respectfully traversed. Submitted herewith are replacement sheets of formal drawings. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) is respectfully traversed. Claim 19 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) rejection moot.

The objection to claims 4 due to an informality is respectfully traversed. Claim 4 has been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to claim 4 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 has been amended to overcome the noted issue in the Office Action, and claims 14, 17 and 19 are cancelled. Claims 12-13, 15 16, 18 and 20 are believed to satisfy Section 112 by virtue of the amendments to claim 11.

Applicants accordingly respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of claims 11-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Long, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,772,454) is respectfully traversed.

Long, Jr. describes a contact having only one latch (36) for retaining the contact to a circuit board.

Claim 1 now recites an electrical contact comprising “a body with a top surface, a bottom surface, and side edges, said body including opposing retention fingers formed integral with said body, each of said retention fingers adapted to secure said body to a single surface of an insulative carrier when said pair of retention fingers are inserted through the carrier.” Long, Jr. neither describes nor suggests a contact having more than one retention finger, much less opposing retention fingers securing the body to a single surface of an insulative carrier.

Claim 1 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Long, Jr.

Claims 2-5 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, and when the recitations of claim 2-5 and 8-10 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, claims 2-5 and 8-10 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Long, Jr.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the Section 102 rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-10 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 11-15, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Pritulsky (U.S. Patent No. 4,264,117) is respectfully traversed.

Pritulsky describe a terminal (18) and housing (16) in relation to a lamp socket. The terminal includes spring arms (46) which engage opposing side surface portions (14) of a glass base (12) of a bulb (8). The spring arms (46) do not engage a single surface of an insulative carrier.

Claim 1 recites an electrical contact comprising “a body with a top surface, a bottom surface, and side edges, said body including opposing retention fingers formed integral with said body, each of said retention fingers adapted to secure said body to a single surface of an insulative carrier when said pair of retention fingers are inserted through the carrier.” Pritulsky. neither describes nor suggests a contact having opposing retention fingers, each of which engage a single surface of an insulative carrier.

Claim 1 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Pritulsky.

Claims 6-7 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 6-7 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent claims 6-7 likewise are patentable over Pritulsky.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the recitations of claim 17, now cancelled, which was indicated as reciting allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Claim 11 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Claims 12-13, 15, and 20 depend, from independent claim 11. When the recitations of claims 12-13, 15, and 20 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 11, Applicants submit that dependent claims 12-13, 15, and 20 likewise are patentable over Pritulsky.

Claim 14 and 19 are cancelled.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 11-15, 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cloutier (U.S. Patent No. 2,775,453) is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of claims 11 and 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the recitations of claim 17, now cancelled, which indicated as reciting allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Claim 11 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Claim 18 depends, from independent claim 11. When the recitations of claim 18 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 11, Applicants submit that dependent claim 18 likewise is patentable over Pritulsky.

The objection to claims 16 and 17 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 has been cancelled. Claim 16 depends from claim 11, which is submitted to be patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth above.

Applicants accordingly request that the objection to claims 16 and 17 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Bruce T. Atkins  
Armstrong Teasdale, LLP  
One Metropolitan Square  
Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
314-621-5070